

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA



FILED
6-02-16
04:59 PM

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Compliance Review of Utility Owned Generation Operations, Electric Energy Resource Recovery Account Entries, Contract Administration, Economic Dispatch of Electric Resources, Utility Owned Generation Fuel Procurement, Diablo Canyon Seismic Studies Balancing Account, and Other Activities for the Period January 1 through December 31, 2015 (U39E).

Application 16-02-019
(Filed February 29, 2016)

**OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL
PORTIONS OF THE TRANSCRIPT
OF THE PREHEARING CONFERENCE
HELD ON JUNE 1, 2016**

ZHEN ZHANG

Attorney

Office of Ratepayer Advocates
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 703-2624
Email: zhen.zhang@cpuc.ca.gov

June 2, 2016

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Compliance Review of Utility Owned Generation Operations, Electric Energy Resource Recovery Account Entries, Contract Administration, Economic Dispatch of Electric Resources, Utility Owned Generation Fuel Procurement, Diablo Canyon Seismic Studies Balancing Account, and Other Activities for the Period January 1 through December 31, 2015 (U39E).

Application 16-02-019
(Filed February 29, 2016)

**OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL
PORTIONS OF THE TRANSCRIPT
OF THE PREHEARING CONFERENCE
HELD ON JUNE 1, 2016**

Pursuant to Rule 11.4(a) of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (“ORA”) submits Motion of Office of Ratepayer Advocates to File Under Seal Portions of the Transcript of the Prehearing Conference Held June 1, 2016 (“Motion”).

On June 1, 2016, Administrative Law Judge Kelly Hymes held a prehearing conference to discuss the Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (“PG&E”) Application (A.) 16-02-019 between 1:30 P.M. and 2:00 P.M., the parties discussed the scope of the proceeding. ORA requested the Commission add to the scope the question of whether PG&E met its burden of proof for cost recovery associated with the greenhouse gas program. ORA listed three specific issues, which included the approximate dollar amounts for direct and indirect costs.

After the prehearing conference, ORA and PG&E conferred and agreed that the dollar amounts for direct and indirect costs are confidential. As such, ORA requests the Commission file under seal portions of page 11 the transcript of the June 1, 2016 prehearing conference discussing the dollar amounts associated with the direct and indirect costs. The portions are:

- Page 11, line 14 through line 15: starting with “the” and ending with “of.”
- Page 11, line 22 through line 23: starting with “which” and ending with “dollars.”

ORA respectfully requests the Commission grant ORA’s Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ ZHEN ZHANG
ZHEN ZHANG

Attorney for

Office of Ratepayer Advocates
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 703-2624
Email: zhen.zhang@cpuc.ca.gov

June 2, 2016

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Compliance Review of Utility Owned Generation Operations, Electric Energy Resource Recovery Account Entries, Contract Administration, Economic Dispatch of Electric Resources, Utility Owned Generation Fuel Procurement, Diablo Canyon Seismic Studies Balancing Account, and Other Activities for the Period January 1 through December 31, 2015 (U39E).

Application 16-02-019
(Filed February 29, 2016)

[PROPOSED ORDER]

On June 2, 2016, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (“ORA”) filed Motion of Office of Ratepayer Advocates to File Under Seal Portions of the Transcript of the Prehearing Conference Held June 1, 2016 (“Motion”). In accordance with the California Public Utilities Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Commission has considered ORA’s Motion. This ruling grants ORA’s Motion.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that ORA’s Motion is granted.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

Administrative Law Judge